

Appendix D—Regional Task Force Addendum

From: Carl Taylor, Regional Task Force Member
To: CITY OF FLAGSTAFF.CITY HALL (umontano)
Date: Thu, Jul 15, 1999 3:03 PM
Subject: Addendum to Regional Plan

Addendum to the Regional Land and Transportation Plan

There were several ideas or policies about which the advisory Planning Team could not reach substantive consensus. In some cases these issues were introduced too late in the process to allow thoughtful consensus-building and in others it did not appear that fundamental consensus would be achieved irrespective of the time spent in discussion.

The following is a synopsis of ideas deemed important to remember and to receive further work as the final Plan is refined and put into operation:

Item One—Need for a *visionary* preamble to the document:

Many members of the Planning Team felt that the emerging document was Dry—very task oriented without reference to the overarching reasons for developing a new plan within the larger vision of our community. It was suggested that portions of the Vision of the Flagstaff 2020 Plan be excerpted and incorporated. This major piece of work involved large segments of the community and provides a philosophical framework for the more detail-oriented Regional Plan. Possible language might be:

This Regional Land and Transportation Plan is based upon the Vision established by the many citizens and organizations of the Flagstaff area and embodied in *A Vision for our Community—Flagstaff 2020*: *In the year 2020, the people of greater Flagstaff have much to celebrate: Their quality of life is a reality that many communities only dream of: the downtown is thriving; the economy is healthy; and the sense of community is solid and strong. Family life is supported in myriad ways—from health care to education to recreation. Individuals are appreciated for who they are and can find opportunities throughout their lives to learn, grow and achieve their dreams. *This Plan advances the process in which the greater Flagstaff community created a vision, goals and action plans to balance social well-being, economic health and environmental quality in the ongoing growth and development of the community.*

Item Two—Policies for encouraging appropriate development of the Planning Reserve Areas (PRAs):

Approximately one-half of the citizen advisory group believes that the proposed PRA process involves too much mandate over private property rights and interests and too little in the way of meaningful incentives to encourage private property owners having land over 25 acres to develop this land in a manner consistent with the long-range goal of greater urban densities contemplated by the Plan. Important ideas not embodied by the Staff writers of this section of the Plan include:

- The requirement to develop at minimum densities is voluntary, and all land within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) should be eligible for designation as Infrastructure Priority Funding Areas (IPFA).
- Areas designated as IPFA would be eligible for incentives for densified development, including City participation in the costs of infrastructure improvements, rapid review and response on proposed projects, adjustments of buy-in fees, etc.
- Projects not applying for IPFA status would retain existing zoning/GMG classifications and not receive any infrastructure assistance or other incentives.

Both approaches (that currently contained in the Plan and that outlined above) were in agreement on the size of parcels to be regulated within the PRAs and the general desirability of the goal of greater density of development within the UGB. The fundamental difference lies in the belief of many of the citizen advisors that mandated participation in minimum density development may be construed as property taking and creates the possibility of litigation rather than the enthusiastic cooperation which might be expected from an approach involving incentives.

Item Three—The Lonetree Traffic Interchange (T.I.):

The proposed traffic interchange at I-40 and Lonetree Road is opposed by a significant number of the Planning Team on the basis that it would be inherently unsafe (due to proximity to the main interchange at I-17 and I-40) and would have the unintended result of dumping more traffic into the already burdened Southside and Downtown areas. The interchange would consume vast amounts of land in its construction due to the hillside configuration of the area and would be highly disruptive during its construction—for little, if any, long term benefit.

Item Four—City policy relative to public land on McMillan Mesa:

The Plan as presently written contemplates a pro-active posture on the part of the City in encouraging the development of the area. Many Task Force members perceived little advantage to selling this highly valued open space in order to encourage development on the one hand and to purchase other open space with the proceeds of the sale on the other. As one member put it: *Sell City open space land to buy open space land or easements elsewhere?*

Many Task Force members believe that a more appropriate stance for the City would be to do nothing—that is remain in a passive mode regarding this public land until a developer comes forward with a truly good plan and process which results in an overall benefit to the community through the sale of the McMillan Mesa land.

Item Five—Policy stance toward gated private communities:

There was not a clear consensus among the task force members on gated communities. Some felt that gated communities do little to foster a sense of larger citizenship or community, and by their nature communicate a separateness which is ultimately harmful to the sense of being part of a greater Flagstaff community. The majority of the Task Force members were in favor of establishing policies which prohibit gated communities within the planning area; a smaller number believed that this would constitute property rights infringement. The issue was repeatedly discussed with no final consensus emerging.